arXiv:1603.07986v2 [physics.gen-ph] 13 Dec 2016

Schrödinger's cat: where does the entanglement come from?

Radu Ionicioiu
Department of Theoretical Physics, Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, 077125 Bucharest–Măgurele, Romania

Schrödinger's cat *Gedankenexperiment* is one of the most striking paradoxes of quantum mechanics and reveals the counterintuitive aspects of the microscopic world. Here I discuss the paradox in terms of quantum information and analyse the information flow between the atom and the cat. The atom and the cat are connected only through a classical information channel: the detector clicks → the poison is released → the cat is killed. No amount of local operations and classical communication can entangle the atom and the cat, which are initially in a separable state. This casts a new light on the paradox.

Schrödinger's cat [1] is arguably the most famous and discussed *Gedankenexperiment* in quantum mechanics. Historically it is also one of the first to reveal the paradoxical nature of quantum theory when applied to macroscopic objects.

Consider a box containing a cat, a radioactive atom in the excited state $|0\rangle_a$ and a detector coupled to the atom. If the atom decays to its ground state $|1\rangle_a$, the detector triggers a mechanism which releases a poison and kills the cat. We then close the box and let the isolated system evolve. In the textbook description of the experiment, after a given time the state of the atom–cat system is [2]

$$|\psi_f\rangle = a|0\rangle_a|alive\rangle_c + b|1\rangle_a|dead\rangle_c \qquad (1)$$

hence the cat is "simultaneously" alive and dead, thus the paradox; usually one takes $a = b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

The state (1) is entangled, as can be seen from the concurrence $C(|\psi_f\rangle) = 2|a \cdot b|$; for $|a| = |b|$ the states is maximally entangled, $C = 1$. Thus it is natural to ask: *where does the entanglement come from?*

Consider the following statements:

(i) the initial state of the system is separable $|0\rangle_a|alive\rangle_c$. The cat is in a well-defined state $|alive\rangle_c$ not entangled with the atom;

(ii) the atom evolves freely to $a|0\rangle_a + b|1\rangle_a$;

(iii) the only coupling between the atom and the cat is via the detector – there is no direct *quantum* interaction between the two;

(iv) the state (1) of the atom–cat system is entangled.

The purpose of this article is to show that there is a contradiction between the first three statements (i)–(iii) and the last one (iv). Briefly, starting with a separable state and having only a classical communication channel between the atom and the cat one cannot generate the entangled state (1).

Let's see first how to prepare the entangled state (1). It is well-known that in order to entangle two (initially separable) systems we need a quantum interaction, for example an entangling gate or a quantum channel (as in entanglement swapping). One can picture this in the standard quantum network formalism – to entangle the atom and the cat we apply a quantum CNOT gate between them, see Fig.1(a). The gate should be fully quantum, i.e., it should operate on quantum superpositions, not only on classical (basis) states.



FIG. 1: A quantum network model reveals the information flow in the *Gedankenexperiment*. Single lines represent quantum systems (qubits) and double lines classical systems (bits); black (red) lines denote the atom (cat). Quantum (classical) information flows along the single (double) lines. (a) Quantum network entangling the atom and the cat. A quantum cat in the initial state $|alive\rangle$ is coupled to the atom via a quantum CNOT gate resulting in the state $a|0\rangle|alive\rangle + b|1\rangle|dead\rangle$ (for simplicity we omit the subscripts a, c). (b) Quantum network for the standard setup of Schrödinger's cat. The atom evolves freely to $a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ and is coupled to the cat via a classical information channel: detector clicks ($m = 1$) → poison is released → cat is killed.

However, this is not the case in the usual setup of the *Gedankenexperiment*. The atom evolves freely to $a|0\rangle_a + b|1\rangle_a$ and the only interaction between the atom and the cat is through the detector: if the detector clicks, a poison is released and the cat is killed with a *classical device*, Fig.1(b). This is a completely classical information channel between the atom and the cat. There is no coherent quantum CNOT gate acting between the atom (the control) and the cat (the target). As it is well-known, no amount of local operations and classical communication (LOCC) can increase the entanglement between two systems. In particular, two initially separable systems cannot become entangled using only LOCC – a quantum interaction is required.

This implies that the final state of the atom–cat system in Fig.1(b) is not described by the entangled state (1), but by a classical statistical mixture

$$\rho = |a|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |alive\rangle\langle alive| + |b|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |dead\rangle\langle dead| \qquad (2)$$

As expected, ρ is separable since the concurrence is $C(\rho) = 0$; this in contrast to the state (1), $C(|\psi_f\rangle) = 2|a \cdot b|$.

To obtain the state (1), which is the crux of the paradox, we need to:

(a) find the appropriate Hilbert space describing the cat. The cat becomes now a quantum system with at least two orthogonal states $|alive\rangle$ and $|dead\rangle$. Here we leave aside

the controversial issue of *how to put a cat in a ket* – what is the Hilbert space of a cat? what is its dimension? etc;

(b) apply (experimentally) a quantum CNOT gate between the atom and the quantum cat.

Thus, unless we are able to perform a fully coherent quantum CNOT gate between the atom and the cat, the final state of the system is described by a statistical mixture (2), not by the entangled state (1). Closing the box and refraining from looking inside (in order to prevent the collapse) will not entangle the atom and the cat. The atom still evolves freely and the only coupling between the two subsystems is via a classical channel which does not generate entanglement.

The difference between classical and quantum information flow can be seen in another *Gedankenexperiment*. By replacing the classical control in the Wheeler's delayed-choice [3] with a quantum control we obtain de quantum delayed-choice experiment [4]. Although the two *Gedankenexperiments* are related, the quantum version gives rise to different phenomena not present in the classical one; these include a morphing behaviour between wave and particle and the ability to measure the control qubit after we measure the system [4, 5].

Interestingly, Schrödinger never wrote the entangled state (1), which later became the standard description of the experiment. The following is the English translation (by J.Trimmer) of Schrödinger's original article [1]:

> *One can even set up quite ridiculous cases. A cat is penned up in a steel chamber, along with the following diabolical device (which must be secured against direct interference by the cat): in a Geiger counter there is a tiny bit of radioactive substance,* so *small, that* perhaps *in the course of one hour one of the atoms decays, but also, with equal probability, perhaps none; if it happens, the counter tube discharges and through a relay releases a hammer which shatters a small flask of hydrocyanic acid. If one has left this entire system to itself for an hour, one would say that the cat still lives* if *meanwhile no atom has decayed. The first atomic decay would have poisoned it. The ψ-function of the entire system would express this by having in it the living and the dead cat (pardon the expression) mixed or smeared out in equal parts.*
>
> *It is typical of these cases that an indeterminacy originally restricted to the atomic domain becomes transformed into macroscopic indeterminacy, which can then be* resolved *by direct observation.*

Some of the attempts to solve the paradox invoke the Many-Worlds interpretation, see [6] for a recent one. Nevertheless, this still does not explain how one can entangle two separable systems using only a classical channel. Jaynes [7, 8] captures well a certain confusion behind the paradox:

> *But our present (quantum mechanical) formalism is not purely epistemological; it is a peculiar mixture describing in part realities of Nature, in part incomplete human information about Nature – all scrambled up by Heisenberg and Bohr into an omelette that nobody has seen how to unscramble. Yet we think that the unscrambling is a prerequisite for any further advance in basic physical theory. For, if we cannot separate the subjective and objective aspects of the formalism, we cannot know what we are talking about; it is just that simple.*

To conclude, Schrödinger's cat is *either* alive *or* dead, not both simultaneously. This kills the paradox (but not the cat).

Acknowledgments. I'm grateful to Daniel Terno for comments and suggestions. This work has been funded through grant PN 16420101/2016.

[1] E. Schrödinger, *Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik*, Die Naturwissenschaften **23**, 807–812; 823–828; 844–849 (1935). English translation: John D. Trimmer, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society **124**, 323–338 (1980), reprinted in J.A.Wheeler and W.H.Zurek (eds.), *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, (Princeton Univ. Press, 1983), pp. 152–167.

[2] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, (Kluwer, 2002), p.373.

[3] J.A. Wheeler, in *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, J.A.Wheeler and W.H. Zurek, eds. (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1984), pp. 182–213.

[4] R.Ionicioiu, D.R.Terno, *Proposal for a Quantum Delayed-Choice Experiment*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **107**, 230406 (2011).

[5] L.C. Céleri, R.M. Gomes, R. Ionicioiu, T. Jennewein, R.B. Mann, D.R. Terno, *Quantum control in foundational experiments*, Foundations of Physics **44**, 576 (2014).

[6] V. Vedral, *Observing The Observer*, arXiv:1603.04583.

[7] E.T. Jaynes, in *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, W.H. Zurek (ed.), Addison-Wesley, 1990, p. 381.

[8] M.F. Pusey, J. Barrett, and T. Rudolph, *On the reality of the quantum state*, Nature Phys. **8**, 475 (2012).